1 (Pages 1 to 4)

	1		3
1	Volume 1, Pages 1-111, Exhibits 1-9	1	May 18, 2005
2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	2	[Witness sworn]
3	FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	3	STEVEN RANDALL KINCAID, Sworn
4	No. 04 CIV 11522 (WGY)	4	EXAMINATION
5	x	5	BY MR. KANE:
6	STEVEN R. KINCAID x	6	Q. State your name for the record, please,
7	Plaintiff x	7	sir.
8	v. x	8	A. Steven R. Kincaid.
9	BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION x	9	Q. What does the R stand for?
10	Defendant x	10	A. Randall; R-a-n-d-a-l-l.
11	х	11	MR. KANE: Let's mark this.
12		12	[Kincaid Exhibit 1 marked for
13	DEPOSITION of STEVEN RANDALL KINCAID, Ph.D.	13	identification]
14	Wednesday, May 18, 2005, 10:15 a.m. to 2:23 p.m.	14	Q. Mr. Kincaid, I'm handing you a marked copy
15	Offices of Edwards & Angell, LLP	15	of an amended notice of deposition. I've given you,
16	101 Federal Street, Boston, Massachusetts	16	actually, two copies. One is marked with the yellow
17		17	sticker and the other is not. The other is for your
18	JONATHAN H. YOUNG, RDR, CRR	18	attorney, Mr. Fine.
19	COURT REPORTER	19	Please take a look at Exhibit Number 1.
20	EPPLEY COURT REPORTING	20	Mr. Kincaid, I understand you may or
21	P. O. Box 382	21	may not have seen that document before, but it was
22	Hopedale, Massachusetts 01747	22	served on you through your counsel; and I'm most
23	508.478.9795 Fax 508.478.0595	23	interested in the second paragraph of the notice,
24	leppley@msn.com	24	requesting that you bring documents, videos, and
		-	requesting that you bring documents, videos, and
	2		4
1	PRESENT:	1	audio recordings in your possession which you
2	David J. Fine, Esq.	2	believe support your claim.
3	Three Center Plaza, Suite 400	3	Do you have any such documents that have
4	Boston, Massachusetts 02108-2003	4	not been previously produced to the defendant Bank
5	617.720.2942 Fax 617.720.0987	5	of America?
6	dvdfine@aol.com	6	A. No, I don't have any more.
7	for the Plaintiff	7	MR. FINE: Let me just note for the
8		8	record that I've permitted the witness to answer
9	Richard F. Kane, Esq.	9	that question; but I believe that this particular
10	McGuireWoods LLP	10	paragraph in the notice of deposition is of no legal
11	Bank of America Corporate Center	11	force or effect, in that it's not a request for
12	100 North Tryon Street, Suite 2900	12	production in accordance with the rules.
13	Charlotte, North Carolina 28202	13	MR. KANE: All right. I disagree, but
14	704.373.8999 Fax 704.373.8935	14	we don't need to resolve that at this point.
15	rkane@mcguirewoods.com	15	Q. Mr. Kincaid, what is your current address?
16	for the Defendant	16	A. Eight Towne Lane, Topsfield, Massachusetts
17		17	01983.
18		18	Q. How long have you lived there?
19		19	A. Two years.
20		20	Q. What is your date of birth?
21		21	A. July 19, 1953.
22		22	Q. Are you married?
23		23	A. No.
24		24	Q. Have you been married?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

2

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

19

16 17

59

57

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that was on television at the time, You De Man, and said what she had said on the phone, and told me I had done a excellent job.

And she said during the telephone conversation that she was going to call Sheila and tell her what a great job I had done, and apparently she did that. I was not involved in the conversation with Sheila.

And Sheila, I can't recall if she e-mailed me or called me directly after, saying, I heard from Susan, and I heard that you had a really outstanding success in your meeting with Vale.

Q. When was the meeting held that you're referring to, that was so successful?

A. Sometime in the fall of 2002. I remember it was on a Friday afternoon.

Q. How long after you had reported for work?

A. I'm guessing it was in October sometime.

Q. What was the subject matter of the meeting?

A. There was a difficulty in this large bank tracking study that involved measurement of statistical significance.

Because measuring statistical significance involves the sample size that is

part of a trend; and you can say, if it's outside the band, above or below of what you would expect from the continuation of the current trend, you can say that is an exceptional result, you are exceptionally good or exceptionally bad.

The advantage of this technique is that it doesn't rely on the number of interviews that are required to gather a survey result; it relies on the number of data points in the past.

So, by doing that, you're able to circumvent this hindrance or obstacle to measuring statistical significance.

Q. So you're breaking it down in kind of a regression analysis?

A. Well, what you're doing is you're looking at it with a different lens.

Instead of using kind of an oldfashioned and traditional tool -- which really handcuffs you, because you can't really ever get enough interviews to break out, and you can't get statistical significance -- you're looking at it with a different lens and saying, if we look at a trend that's been established by previous data

24 points, what would constitute a meaningful

58

in a survey, it's very difficult in big banking tracking studies to ever achieve statistical

3 significance, because you really can't

4 interview that many people.

> You would have to interview literally millions of people every quarter to get enough people to make it be statistically significant.

And the people in Vale's group were struggling with how to generate action from the 10 bank's senior management when they were unable to say that satisfaction had improved significantly or 12 declined significantly.

And this was a quandary or a problem that was kind of amenable to my skills, and I came up with a way to solve their problem and presented it to them.

17 Q. What was your method for solving the 18 problem?

A. Well, the method was not to abandon the use of the formal or kind of old-fashioned management of 20 21 statistical significance.

22 If you use a different analysis

23 technique, multiple regression, you can identify

the band within which a result would fall if it was

departure from that trend, either higher 1 2 or lower.

Q. What about Mr. Kotopoulos? You say he also praised your work; is that correct?

A. Yes.

When I finished my monograph about how to redo, or a better way to do, the statistical driver analysis, his specific words I believe were This is a big win for the bank; and he told me I had done a good job.

Q. And when was that?

11 12 A. That would have been in probably December 13 of 2002.

14 Q. And that's when you completed the 15 monograph? Is that ph?

A. Monograph, ph, yes.

The time that the monograph was actually done is not clear; because there were a number of drafts of it, and the substance of the work was done at the end of 2002, in December.

For reasons unclear to me, the monograph was not publicized and was not rolled out, as they say, until several months into 2003.

Q. Do you know if the bank is still using that

60

## Steven Randall Kincaid, Ph.D. May 18, 2005

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

22

23

24

you?

Vale? What sort of praise did he direct towards

A. Principally, I think that it was at

63 61 our exceptionally successful meeting that was in 1 monograph? 1 October, that I mentioned earlier. He was quite 2 2 A. I do not know. impressed with my idea about using regression 3 Q. Any other praise from Mr. Kotopoulos? 3 instead of formal significance testing. A. That's all I can recall. 4 5 Q. Any other occasion? Q. How about Sheila Burroughs? 5 6 A. No. A. On I guess occasions kind of too many to 6 Q. How about Paul, whose last name you can't 7 7 mention individually, she said I was doing a good 8 remember? 8 job, I had met her expectations, I was providing 9 A. Paul and I worked together on training effective stimulation and leadership to the people his staff to carry out the new, different method in the bank, and I was being successful in 10 10 of driver analysis I developed; and Paul said that 11 11 bringing ideas to them that they had not I was welcome as a senior advanced resource on had previously. 12 12 13 statistical analysis, because they had not had O. Was this throughout your employment that 13 14 resources like that in the department 14 Sheila... 15 previously. 15 A. I would say it was up until February or 16 And he himself was highly interested in 16 March of 2003. this analysis, had not had a great deal of occasion 17 Q. Did something change in your relationship 17 18 to practice it, but was very much interested in the 18 in February or March of 2003? 19 topic, and he was glad that I was there because I 19 A. Well, in April of 2003 she dramatically was an experienced person in the area; changed her relationship with me, and gave me a very 20 20 21 and he had had issues with Richard negative personnel evaluation, and told me that my 21 22 McFarland, who was another advanced analyst but was position was in jeopardy. 22 23 not necessarily well versed in analysis of survey 23 Q. Did she praise your performance at any time after that April appraisal? 24 data. 24 64 62 Q. And how about Chuck? A. Yes, she did. 1 1 2 Q. I'm sorry? A. Chuck's area was the area where I first 2 tested out my new method of driver analysis. He 3 3 A. Yes, she did. 4 gave me a set of data that had already been gathered 4 Q. On what occasions do you remember she 5 5 and asked me to try out, in terms of a dry run, my praised you? 6 method on his data. A. On a couple of occasions in meetings we had 6 7 And I did so; and the results my 7 I had ideas about how to improve different aspects 8 analysis came up with were more focused and more of customer-satisfaction research, and she said that 9 actionable than what he had received previously, and they were good ideas; and in weekly meetings, which 9 10 remedied some problems he had had in trying to we had every week, shortly after giving me a very 10 11 communicate the results of the survey to his 11 negative review, she said that my performance had gotten better. 12 clients. 12 Q. Any others who praised your performance? Q. Did you say that was shortly after the 13 13 14 A. Yes. I worked a great deal with an negative review? 14 15 individual named Alan Church. A. Correct; within two to three weeks after 15 16 He worked in Vale's area, and he the negative review. 16 was in charge of working with people that helped in 17 17 Q. Any other praise following that? the real-estate area or were customer-satisfaction-A. No; none that I can remember at this time. 18 18 19 advised in the real-estate area, and I helped them 19 O. We're talking Sheila Burroughs. 20 redo their method of driver analysis in much the 20 A. Right. 21 same way as I helped people within CAMR, and I O. How about the individual whose nickname is 21

22

23

24

worked quite a bit with Alan.

Q. And did he praise your work?

A. Frequently. He had me speak to all